REMARKS

In response to the final office Action dated May 16, 2011, the Assignee respectfully requests continued examination and reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks. The Assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims distinguish over the cited documents.

Claims 45-49, 51-53, 55-60, 62-63, and 65-66 are pending in this application. Claims 1-44, 50, 54, 61, and 64 have been, or previously were, canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Petition for Extension of Time

Examiner Strange, this response includes a petition for an extension of time. The Assignee respectfully petitioned the Commissioner for a one month extension of time from August 16, 2011 to September 16, 2011. The 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 (a) (1) large entity fee was electronically paid at submission.

Rejection of Claims under § 103 (a)

The Office rejected all pending claims 45-49, 51-53, 55-60, 62-63, and 65-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,327,574 to Kramer, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent 7,228,283 to Hornstein.

This rejection has been rendered moot by amendment. These claims have been amended to recite, or to incorporate, features that distinguish over *Kramer* with *Hornstein*. Independent claim 45, for example, has been amended to recite "*determining the content tag matches the profile tag when at least three identifiers of the multiple identifiers match.*" Support for these features may be found at least at page 24, lines 20-23. Independent claim 45 has also been amended to recite "*when the content tag does not match the profile tag*" then "*retrieving another profile tag from the user profile and successively comparing each identifier of the content tag to*

each corresponding identifier of the another profile tag." Support for these features may be found at least at page 25, line 23 though page 26, line 2. Independent claim 45 has also been amended to recite "*when the user profile contains no more profile tags, then retrieving the multiple identifiers of another content tag from the memory and successively comparing each identifier of the another content tag to each corresponding identifier of the profile tag.*" Support for these features may be found at least at page 26, lines 3-20. Independent claim 45 has also been amended to recite "*determining the another content tag matches the profile tag and incrementing the score when the match occurs.*" Support for these features may be found at least at page 26, lines 3-20. Independent claims 56 and 66 have been amended to recite similar features.

At least these features are not obvious over *Kramer* with *Hornstein*. The proposed combination of *Kramer* with *Hornstein* discusses how content is selected to appeal to a profile. *See* U.S. Patent 6,327,574 to Kramer, *et al.* at column 9, lines 45-53. An "attribute vector" is used in scoring "illuminations." *See id.* at column 21, lines 51-60. The proposed combination of *Kramer* with *Hornstein* also describes a matching process that compares a "field in a profile tag to a value in a corresponding field of [a] product tag." *See* U.S. Patent 7,228,283 to Hornstein at column 8, lines 1-33. Still, though, *Kramer* with *Hornstein* fails to teach or suggest "*when the content tag does not match the profile tag*" then "*retrieving another profile tag from the user profile and successively comparing each identifier of the content tag to each corresponding identifier of the another profile tag.*" The proposed combination of *Kramer* with *Hornstein* also fails to teach or suggest "*when the user profile contains no more profile tags, then retrieving the multiple identifiers of another content tag from the memory and successively comparing each identifier of the another content tag to each corresponding identifier of the profile tag.*" The proposed combination of *Kramer* with *Hornstein* also fails to teach or suggest "*determining the another content tag matches the profile tag and incrementing the score when the match occurs.*" Indeed, the proposed combination of *Kramer* with *Hornstein* fails to retrieve and compare "*another profile tag*" to the "*content tag*" when a <u>previous</u> "*content tag does not match the profile tag.*" Indeed, *Kramer* with *Hornstein* is silent to many of the features recited by the independent claims.

Claims 45-49, 51-53, 55-60, 62-63, and 65-66, then, are not obvious over *Kramer* with *Hornstein*. The independent claims recite many distinguishing features, and the dependent claims incorporate these same distinguishing features and recite additional features. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that claims 45-49, 51-53, 55-60, 62-63, and 65-66 are obvious. The Office must remove the § 103 (a) rejection.

_____

If any issues remain outstanding, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or *scott@scottzimmerman.com*.

37 C.F.R. § 1.8 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted via the USPTO EFS web interface on September 14, 2011.

Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 41,390